

Delegate Storm, do you desire to offer your amendment to Amendment 3?

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman, if it is in order, I would like to wait until a vote is taken on Amendment No. 3. I do not want to lose any votes for it by putting any amendment in.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be too late. We are ready to vote on Amendment No. 3. You would have to submit your amendment at this point.

DELEGATE STORM: I will submit it, then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the pages please distribute amendment ZE.

Delegate Storm, I think the Chair is perhaps hyper-technical in that ruling. I made it because the way in which you stated your amendment. But, I take it, instead of substituting some language in the amendment, your wording would add the word "sex." Giving regard to substance rather than to form, the Chair would advise you that if you desire, your amendment would be submitted after Amendment No. 3, if Amendment No. 3 is adopted. If Amendment No. 3 is not adopted, I assume you would not offer your amendment.

DELEGATE STORM: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Hold amendment ZE in abeyance for the time being. The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 3. Is there further discussion?

Delegate Kiefer.

DELEGATE KIEFER: Mr. Chairman, I desire to make my position known with respect to Amendment No. 3. I am opposed to it because I do not think it does anything for this constitution.

The only advantage that it possibly does is to give some psychological satisfaction to a group of people. I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that it does not increase their rights or anybody else's rights; that the word "persons" means black, white, red, green, checkered, or anything else, and that it means male or female.

I therefore say that what we have said in this language clearly and explicitly sets forth exactly what we mean, and for this reason, and not because I am opposed to the position of Mrs. Mitchell, I am opposed to this amendment.

I want it clearly understood I shall vote against it, not because I am against any

particular group of people, but because I am in favor of keeping this constitution simple.

We do not propose in this new constitution a provision which is in the present constitution; namely prohibition against re-establishment of slavery. In a few years remarks about discrimination or slavery will be silly.

We have laid it out in our recommendation. I hope you will vote against Amendment No. 3.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the Amendment?

Delegate Koger?

DELEGATE KOGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the Amendment No. 3. You may proceed.

DELEGATE KOGER: I would like to say that we hear much about the moral decay engulfing our nation. Are we placing the wrong emphasis on values? Is skin pigmentation superior to achievement, valor, morality? How can we justify our preachments of democracy and justice and freedom to all when a man who is courteous and clean is denied a thirty-five cent beer by a public licensee simply because he is a Negro?

Color prejudice is a thing most foul. I can change my speech, learn Italian, Russian, Hottentot or Japanese. I can change my religion worship Christ, Jehovah, Mohammed or Buddha. I can acquire any trait, ethnic quality or environmental habit, yet I cannot change my skin.

Why should Delegates Dabrowski or Hostetter expect my son to make a greater sacrifice on the battlefield than theirs? You can go all over the world—China, India, Russia, France—only here is a man denied rights because of something he can do nothing about. This is the injustice of it all. It is truly a phenomenon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Delegate Child?

DELEGATE CHILD: I do not want to take up any more time, but I want to emphasize my position. I am certainly not in favor of any discrimination of anyone, and if I thought that the language as we have